

Whereas the recognition by allies of the United States of the importance of United States armed forces for security in the Asia-Pacific region confers on the United States irreplaceable good will and diplomatic influence in that region;

Whereas Japan's host nation support is a key element in the ability of the United States to maintain forward-deployed forces in that country;

Whereas the Governments of the United States and Japan, in the Special Action Committee on Okinawa Final Report issued by the United States-Japan Security Consultative Committee established by the two countries, have made commitments to reducing the burdens of United States forces on the people of Okinawa;

Whereas such commitments will maintain the operational capability and readiness of United States forces;

Whereas the people of Okinawa have borne a disproportionate share of the burdens of United States military bases in Japan; and

Whereas gaining the understanding and support of the people of Okinawa in fulfilling these commitments is crucial to effective implementation of the Treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States of America and Japan remains vital to the security interests of the United States and Japan, as well as the security interests of the countries of the Asia-Pacific region; and

(2) the people of Okinawa deserve special recognition and gratitude for their contributions toward ensuring the treaty's implementation and regional peace and stability.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1997

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 21. I further ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted and that the Senate then immediately resume consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, the first concurrent budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I further ask unanimous consent that at 9:30 a.m., Senator KENNEDY, or his designee, be recognized to offer his amendment on tobacco taxes. Following the disposition of the Kennedy amendment, I ask unanimous consent that Senator GRAMM be recognized to offer his amendment regarding deficit neutral natural disaster relief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Senators can expect rollcall votes throughout Wednesday's session as the Senate attempts to complete work on the first concurrent budget resolution. The majority leader states that he is still hopeful that the Democratic leader will join him in an effort to yield back

much of the statutory time limitation for the budget resolution. All Members will be notified accordingly as any votes are ordered with respect to any amendments to this important legislation. Again, on behalf of the majority leader, I want to remind all Members that this is the last week prior to the Memorial Day recess, so we will appreciate all Members' cooperation in scheduling of votes and of other floor action. The majority leader expresses thanks to all Members for their attention.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment, under the previous order, following the remarks of the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly on the plan to pump up the Pentagon budget. This resolution jacks it up by \$2.6 billion in budget authority.

Last year, by comparison, we were staring at a \$10 to \$12 billion increase in the defense budget.

I was very much opposed to such a large increase and did everything I could to block it all the way through the process. In the end, I failed.

This year's proposed defense add-on of \$2.6 billion is relatively modest.

Mr. President, I do not intend to offer an amendment to kill the \$2.6 billion add-on.

I know defense is a top priority in the agreement and the defense number constitutes a carefully crafted consensus. Like last year, however, I still think we should stick with the President's request.

The \$265 billion requested by the President for defense is plenty to maintain a strong national defense—if the money is spent right. Unfortunately, that's not what happens. Some of it will be wasted.

The Pentagon is like a ravenous monster that has an insatiable appetite for money. I am afraid the \$2.6 billion add-on will be frittered away on cold war relics.

Mr. President, I think we need to give the Pentagon some strict guidance about how the extra money may be spent. The Budget Committee could do it. The Armed Services Committee could do it. Or the Appropriations Committee could do it. Somebody needs to do it.

The language should stipulate that the extra money be used exclusively to maintain the force structure and combat readiness. Otherwise, the Pentagon bureaucrats are going to rob the readiness accounts to pay for moderniza-

In recent years, DOD has consistently promised to pay for modernization with savings derived from lower infrastructure costs. But the promised savings have never materialized. So they rob the readiness accounts to get the money. We should not let that happen.

Mr. President, the highly touted Quadrennial Defense Review or QDR will not solve this problem. The QDR is just a smoke screen for the status quo. It's another cover for robbing the readiness accounts to pay for modernization. The QDR is simply a repeat of the Bottom-Up Review.

They douse the cold war programs with perfume to make them smell better, but it is still the same old stuff. We still have cold war programs hooked up to a post-cold war budget. This is a recipe for disaster.

The QDR tells us to keep spending money on all the cold war relics—like the F-22 fighter. The F-22 is an excellent case in point. The F-22 was designed to defeat a Soviet military threat that is now ancient history. And its cost is spinning out of control.

In 1991, we were told that we could buy 750 F-22's for \$58 billion. Now we are told that far fewer F-22's will cost \$6 billion more. The quantity drops by 40 percent and the price goes up by 10 percent. That's the Pentagon way.

Four hundred thirty-eight F-22's are now estimated to cost \$64 billion total, and production hasn't even started yet. If current trends continue, the Air Force will be lucky to get 200 F-22's for \$100 billion.

Mr. President, I think the F-22 is the threat. The F-22 has the potential for ruining the Air Force. It will eat away at Air Force fighter muscle and will totally demolish plans to modernize the fighter force.

With the F-22, the Air Force will be lucky to have 2 or 3 wings—total, versus its force of 20 wings today. During the Reagan years, we actually had 40 wings and planned for more.

Lockheed Martin CEO Norman Augustine put this problem in perspective in his book "The Defense Revolution."

I would like to quote from his book. He is an authority. He should know. This is what Mr. Augustine said:

If the cost of tactical aircraft continues to increase as it has since the World War I Spad [airplane], a projection of the history of the defense budget over the past century leads to the calculation that in the year 2054 the entire U.S. defense budget will purchase exactly one aircraft.

The F-22 is a prime candidate for fulfilling Mr. Augustine's prophecy.

Mr. President, we need to reverse this trend. We should make sure the extra money is used to maintain combat readiness. The extra money should be used to buy more training, fuel, spare parts, and maintenance. And that's it.

Mr. President, we need to take some drastic action. The centerpiece of Mr. COHEN's QDR is the plan to retain a capability to fight two major regional

conflicts or MRC's simultaneously. If we fail to protect readiness and force structure, Mr. COHEN's two MRC's will be nothing but a pipe dream.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues on the defense committees will find a way to strike a better balance between readiness and modernization.

We must put well-trained, combat-ready troops ahead of obsolete programs.

That is the real choice. It is the only choice.

Mr. President, when I look at this budget agreement, I find myself playing Hamlet. I go back and forth, between all the good things, and all the bad things. And then I agonize over which way to go. To agree or not to agree. That is the question.

Usually when the leaders of the two parties get together on a budget agreement, it ends up being bad news. It means spending goes up for programs favored by each side. It is like a rising tide lifting all boats. And then the deficit is made to look OK. A little fairy dust produces a sudden windfall of revenues. This time it happens to be 225 billion dollars' worth.

I think back to the Rose Garden Budget in 1984 under President Reagan. And, the Andrews Air Force Base agreement in 1990. They were similar.

"Rising Tide" agreements do two things. First, all the sacred cows get more money than they should. Second, accountability for those programs goes out the window. Desperately needed reforms do not take place.

In 1984, we should have frozen the defense budget and demanded reforms. Instead we looked the other way. The freeze did not occur until the next year—with my amendment—and the reforms did not take place until 3 years later—with Nunn-Goldwater and the Packard Commission. By that time, we had already poured lots of money down a rathole.

In addition, with rising tide agreements, the budget enforcements we put in place are then violated. We saw that in 1990, when we gave Gramm-Rudman a fix. The only thing we fixed in that budget was the ability to overtax and overspend. Now, we're seeing another enforcement violated to accommodate the rising tide—and that's Exon-Grassley. If we violated budget enforcement before, why should we believe it won't happen again?

Meanwhile, in this budget, the absence of Medicare reform is deafening. A colossal structural nightmare is facing us just 15 years down the road. Especially in Medicare. Long-term reform is needed. Does this budget address that? No.

And the sacred cows? Two examples. One supported by my side of the aisle, another by the other side.

The cold war is over. But we need to spend an extra \$2.6 billion this year for a defense budget that's still geared toward fighting the cold war. The same cold war that disappeared 10 years ago.

What the Pentagon should not do—but will do with this money—is buy a

bunch of cold war relics, like the F-22 fighter. That money should be going into the readiness and training accounts. But it won't be. Because politics is more powerful than common-sense.

The Quadrennial Defense Review is simply a repeat of the Bottom-Up Review. It's a smokescreen to maintain the status quo, to plan for an obsolete war. Meanwhile, this is the same defense budget with 50 billion dollars' worth of unmatched disbursements, which cannot pass an audit, and whose financial records are in absolute chaos. We do not know what anything costs. It is hard to make rational decisions on bad information. It is a budget crying out for reform.

But that is OK. Because the other side of the aisle also has a few sacred cows crying out for reform. But we'll pump those up, too. Take AmeriCorps. Cannot pass an audit. Cannot even be audited. No accountability. In bad need of reform. We were shelling out \$27,000 per volunteer. That is crazy.

So, last year we froze AmeriCorps and pushed for reforms. They have been promised, but not yet delivered. But this agreement would jeopardize reform and accountability at AmeriCorps. Instead of a freeze, plus reforms, this program will get an extra three-quarters of a billion dollars, plus no incentive to implement the promised reforms. And that hurts the efforts of many of us who have tried to save this program, but make sure the taxpayers are getting their money's worth.

Finally, there is the matter of the deficits. Under this agreement, they go up, and then they fall off the table. In other words, the only progress on deficit reduction comes in the last 2 years. This reflects that phenomenon I call the narcotic of optimism. We're still addicted to it. It is simply not realistic. But it sure feels good.

So that is a mountain of reasons why this agreement is bad. The reasons on the good side are not as impressive-sounding. But there are a couple of reasons.

First, even though the tide is rising, it does not mean we cannot push even harder for reforms, to make sure they take hold. We desperately need long-term Medicare reform. We have a responsibility to provide it. We cannot duck it. If it takes a bipartisan commission instead of a budget agreement, so be it.

But the most powerful reason, in my mind, in favor of this agreement, is that it is a bipartisan agreement of the leaders. When's the last time we saw that in this town? This is a first step, and only a first step. But it represents clearing a major, major hurdle—which was a lack of bipartisan cooperation. The importance of that accomplishment cannot be underestimated. And the desire of the American people to have us working together instead of fighting all the time also cannot be underestimated.

And so that means, even though I have a mountain of reasons to oppose this agreement, and even though the reasons for supporting it are the size of a mouse by comparison, it is a mouse that roars for us to take the first step.

And if we take that step, it means we are all the more obliged to pursue reforms in the meantime, and make sure we stick to the enforcement measures.

And so, Mr. President, I think ultimately the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, and the other leaders on both sides of the aisle are to be commended for taking a positive, yet very difficult first step toward addressing our fiscal problems. Even though I might disagree with much of this agreement, I look forward to supporting it, and then appealing to my colleagues over the next 5 years to keep us on track for two things: a balanced budget, and much needed program reforms.

THE CERTIFICATION PROCESS II

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, recently I spoke about the annual certification process on drug cooperation. I wanted to follow up on those remarks. As I noted then, I believe it is important to address some of the myths that have grown up around certification. I also believe that it is important to put on record why we need to keep this process.

One of the reasons often advanced for doing away with the certification process is that it just makes administrations lie.

Now, in the first place, I don't believe that this is true. But even if it were, I do not see changing a valid oversight requirement by Congress on the premise that compliance makes liars out of the administration. It seems to me that if there is a law and the administration isn't being honest, then you take steps to hold it responsible. You don't shrug your shoulders and throw away the law. Where would we be if we did that routinely? We might as well forget about oversight. We might as well legalize lying.

Like many of my colleagues, I have had problems with the executive branch. I am aware of misconduct, misfeasance, and downright lying by executive branch agencies and agents.

But I do not believe that simple differences of opinion or interpretation necessarily constitute lying. It is even possible to disagree over policy without calling someone a liar for disagreeing. Misguided perhaps.

It is possible, then, that the administration and Congress might disagree over a particular certification decision without jumping to conclusions about motive. It is also possible to have such differences without concluding that the only proper recourse is to scrap oversight efforts. Accountability is essential to our political process. This holds true even when there are serious disagreements about outcomes and procedures.